

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting**  
**Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ**  
**Tuesday, April 15, 2014 - 5:30 p.m.**

**1. VERIFICATION OF NOTICE**

Chair Losoff verified the meeting had been properly noticed.

**2. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, & ROLL CALL**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present:** Chair Marty Losoff, Vice Chair Michael Hadley and Commissioners Eric Brandt, John Currivan, Scott Jablow and Kathy Levin. Commissioner Norm Taylor was excused.

**Staff Present:** Andy Dickey, Audree Juhlin, Cari Meyer, Charles Mosley, David Peck, Donna Puckett and Ron Ramsey

*Chair Losoff indicated that he was going to address agenda item 4 before agenda item 3.*

**4. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:**

- a. March 18, 2014 (R)
- b. March 18, 2014 (SV)
- c. March 27, 2014 (WS)

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Brandt moved to approve the March 18th regular session minutes. Vice Chair Hadley seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Taylor was excused.*

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Brandt moved to approve the minutes of the March 18th site visit. Commissioner Jablow seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Vice Chair Hadley abstained, because he was not present at the site visit. Commissioner Taylor was excused.*

**MOTION:** *Vice Chair Hadley moved to approve the minutes of the March 27th work session. Commissioner Currivan seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (5) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Commissioner Brandt abstained, because he was not present for the work session. Commissioner Taylor was excused.*

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS BY COMMISSIONERS & STAFF**

Audree Juhlin reported that the steel beams are being erected at Mariposa, so they are moving forward. There was a concern at their Plan Review stage, because the mechanical equipment area as presented was four air conditioning units; however, a total of nine units and some additional mechanical equipment hadn't been taken into consideration. Staff has the discretion to approve plans that are a little different from what was presented to the Commission, but staff felt this was just enough different to require some additional input, so an impromptu meeting was held at the site this afternoon, and it was determined that staff will work with them as they place the mechanical equipment, to ensure it is properly screened.

Chair Losoff indicated that he and the Vice Chair were invited to attend the impromptu meeting and the President of the Rolling Hills Association was also present. They are moving some of the mechanical equipment off of the roof, and it made sense for them to go ahead, but as a

condition, it was agreed that they would put the equipment in place, and then we will see what screening will be put in. Vice Chair Hadley added that it was decided that they should be allowed to place the equipment, and then the height needed for the screening can be determined, to shield it from Rolling Hills and the Casa Contenta neighborhood.

5. **PUBLIC FORUM: For items not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission – limit of three minutes per presentation. Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public.**

*Chair Losoff opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.*

6. **CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING REQUEST(S) THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:**

- a. **PZ13-00013 (DEV, ZC, Development Agreement, Land Exchange): Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Development Review, Zone Change, Land Exchange, and Development Agreement approval to construct 32 new lodging units, associated site improvements, and a new right-of-way at 95 Goodrow Lane (Sedona Rouge). The property is zoned L (Lodging). A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the northeast corner of W State Route 89A and Rodeo Road. The lot is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 408-24-071B. Applicant: Sedona Rouge, LLC; Staff: Cari Meyer, Associate Planner (60 minutes; 5:45 pm–6:45 pm)**

Chair Losoff pointed out that the Commission can consider the Development Review for approval, make a recommendation on the Zone Change to the City Council, and review a copy of the Development Agreement for information purposes and suggestions, since the City Council has the sole responsibility for the Development Agreement.

**Staff's Presentation:**

Cari Meyer introduced Al Walburg, an owner of Sedona Rouge, and Erik Peterson, Architect. Cari then provided an overview of the request presented in the Staff Report, including a summary of the project background and components, the site with the current and proposed ownership of parcels with a land exchange, and the previous meetings and site visits held. Cari then explained the location of the project, the surrounding area and the parcels in the proposed project. She also pointed out the proposed buildings for the 32 lodging units, the proposed parking lot and the event lawn on the site plan, and explained that the proposed floor plan actually shows 36 rooms, however, four of the rooms proposed would be rented only in conjunction with an adjoining room.

Cari then reviewed the elevations of the proposed buildings and indicated that the buildings would match the existing Sedona Rouge in colors and architectural details, and a perspective was provided showing how the proposed buildings would fit with the existing hotel and spa. Regarding the Landscaping Plan submitted, Cari explained that there is a code requirement that 25% of shrubs are to be native evergreen species. Their plan shows 21.7%; however, 100% of the shrubs are native or adaptive and 56.3% are evergreen, and the Landscape Architect has explained that all native or adaptive shrubs have the same water requirement and the plan has been designed to shut off the irrigation system after the plants are established. Therefore, if the Commission determines that the plan meets the intent of the code, it can be approved as is or there could be a condition added that when the applicant returns for Landscaping Permits, 25% of the shrubs are to be shown as native evergreen.

Cari then explained that there had been questions about the outdoor event lawn, and since this is an accessory use to the hotel, Condition 10 has been included to limit the use of the lawn without a separate Temporary Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit, including limiting use to hotel guests in March through October, retaining parking within the Rouge property, ending amplified noise by 9:00 p.m., having a maximum of 100 people at an event, having a Rouge staff member available at all times to address any issues, and serving food and alcohol service in compliance with any State and

County regulations. The applicant could apply for a Temporary Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit if their use would exceed the limitations, or if their use of the lawn became a public nuisance, the Director could require a separate permit.

Cari discussed the public notification to all properties within 500 ft. and all properties with access off of Goodrow Lane. A number of phone calls and one written comment were received prior to the distribution of the Commission's packet. The comments were in regard to the design of the buildings, etc., use of the event lawn, emergency access, screening from adjacent properties, traffic issues, lighting and signage. Additionally, a petition was later received regarding the safety of the new road, and as a result of public input, city staff contacted ADOT regarding potential changes to the S.R. 89A and Rodeo traffic signal, and ADOT indicated that they would be looking at that.

Cari indicated that the applicant held two open houses on January 17th and provided additional contact information. The comments they received were in regard to the traffic flow, the substandard nature of Goodrow Lane, possible changes at the S.R. 89A and Rodeo Road intersection, and concerns about increased traffic on Rodeo Road. The applicant has talked with the neighbors and addressed some of the concerns, including the addition of additional landscaping between the new road and property to the north.

Cari explained that in addition to the Development Review, the other components are the Land Exchange, Zone Change and Development Agreement, and final action for those will be taken by the City Council after the Commission makes a recommendation. She again showed the parcels that would be involved in the land exchange, in addition to the new city street that would be constructed by the applicant. Cari then explained that the Zone Change is required, because the applicant's parcel is currently zoned for lodging; however, the city's parcel is currently a right-of-way and the zoning designation only goes to the centerline of the street, and the property to the east is zoned Residential, so one-half of the parcel is zoned Residential and one-half is zoned Lodging. The whole area is designated as a Planned Area in the Community Plan and the connection created by the new road was identified in the Community Plan as desirable.

Cari indicated that the Development Agreement is to address the need for assurances of development and the timing. The City didn't want to exchange the land without the road being constructed and the applicant did not want to build the road without the assurance that the land exchange would be approved. If the Development Agreement is approved by the City Council, the deeds for the parcels would be placed in an escrow account to transfer the ownership of the parcels and allow abandonment of the existing vehicular access easements across the property after the completion of the new road, in addition to memorializing the long-term commitments made by the applicant.

Cari then read staff's recommendations of approval for the Development Review and the Zone Change presented in the Staff Report.

**Commission's Questions of Staff:**

- Question regarding plans for Parcel B once it is turned over to Sedona Rouge. Cari explained it would become the applicant's private property and a parking lot is proposed in that area with a gate at the northern end of the property that will open automatically for vehicles approaching from the south, but would prevent vehicles coming from the north from going through the property. The residents to the north would still be able to travel up Goodrow, but exit on the new road.
- Clarification requested regarding the number of written public comments. Cari explained that one was included by the applicant in their application materials, one was submitted to staff and one was submitted prior to the distribution of the Commission's packet. Cari also indicated that the applicant provided one comment just prior to the meeting that says, "I approve the plan."

**Applicant's Presentation:**

Erik Peterson, Architect, indicated that they feel they have an exciting plan that fits into the existing hotel and neighborhood, and makes a safer site as well. Erik explained a rendering of the site, showing the Goodrow entrance, a proposed inlet to allow guests to access the parking area for the new rooms, and the new road. Erik then explained the site plan, including the new parking area, current and new lobby space, etc. Eric also indicated that the existing event lawn is approximately 50 ft. from the proposed event lawn.

Eric explained an updated view of the Landscape Plan, in reference to the slope of the site, with a wall that acts as a backdrop to the event space and acts as a buffer, since it will reflect any noise back into their space. Additionally, there is a buffer of more landscape, and then the new access road and another wall that leads to the property line. Both walls will help hide the functions and reflect sound away from the residential areas. Additionally, the height of the building is less than the height of the existing building, because they don't want to lose the views from the upper rooms.

Erik indicated that their elevations are in conformance with the guidelines and under the height regulations with architectural details that fit with the existing hotel, and the two different buildings have a slightly different character. He then discussed the undulations of the buildings, the material of the tile roofs, the shadow lines, etc., and explained that the angled view is to achieve the best view of the inner landscaped area and the mountains.

**Commission's Questions, Comments and Concerns:**

Prior to opening the public comment period, Chair Losoff asked Commissioner Currivan to read into the record the petition received with 19 signatures, and Commissioner Currivan read the statement received on April 9th titled, "Re: Changes to Goodrow Lane due to the proposed Sedona Rouge Expansion:

"We, the undersigned, are opposed to the land swap unless it is specifically agreed that our direct access to and from 89A via Goodrow Lane is not restricted nor altered from its current state. We feel that the cross road to Rodeo in addition to direct access to 89A from Goodrow is both safer and less subject to the time consuming delays than forcing all traffic to enter and exit on Rodeo."

Chair Losoff then asked staff to review the response received from ADOT regarding the City's inquiry about the light at Rodeo Road and making two turn lanes. David Peck indicated that ADOT stated that the level of service for the current p.m. hour at the southbound left-turn lane from Rodeo onto 89A is level of service D with an average delay of 47.1 seconds, and with the Sedona Rouge plus residents, it will only increase to 48.5 seconds and remain a level of service D, so they agree with the idea of making two left-turn lanes on Rodeo onto 89A for the southbound movement, identical to Coffee Pot and 89A. They plan to make that change later this summer, depending on their personnel level.

*Chair Losoff opened the public comment period at this time.*

**David Corder, Sedona, AZ:** Indicated that he circulated the petition and of all the people he talked to, only one refused to sign it. The general consensus is that the City gains by the change, but they lose an entrance and an exit from their property, and that is an inconvenience they would rather do without. Safety has been used as an issue and they would like to point out that the City's Traffic Report shows Police Reports indicating there were 19 accidents at the light compared to five accidents at Goodrow. If you add more traffic to Rodeo, you are adding more congestion and more likelihood of accidents, so they don't feel it is safer. The traffic lights at Coffee Pot and Rodeo to a large extent break traffic on 89A into a broken flow, which allows access onto the road going either to the west or the east. You can use the median to go halfway, even under heavy conditions, so they feel it is an advantage to have two ways in and out of their residences. In addition, on the north side of 89A between Coffee Pot and Rodeo, there are 10 accesses onto 89A and more than half of those have heavier traffic than Goodrow Lane, so it is not reasonable to say it is unsafe for people from Goodrow to access 89A, but it is safe for people from Coffee Pot Restaurant or the

bank or even from Sedona Rouge. They are familiar with the area and as such they should be more familiar with the traffic conditions and be able to use those access points safer than the tourists, so it doesn't make any sense that it is a safety issue that is driving closing Goodrow to 89A access.

**Jim DeGeorge, Sedona, AZ:** Indicated that he represents six properties affected and he is a little concerned by the characterization that there hasn't been public input. He has been in dialogue with Ed Conway and Cari Meyer with numerous phone calls and discussions that detailed his concerns, so to marginalize it and say you only got this -- he is glad you got the petition. His concern is safety; the area where the road is going in is about four-fifths of the way down the steepest downhill on Goodrow. It is a blind downhill and he has driven that road since 1982. Coming down that road when they have back ice, they carefully coast down to the flat, but with this, they will have to make better than a 100° right turn after coming down a blind downhill to a stop. Coming up that road, his vehicle can't make a left turn from a standing stop on black ice and climb that hill, and coming down that road, there is very little chance that he will be able to stop before crashing into the Rouge's gate. This is putting a near complete stop and more than a 100° right turn at the worse possible location on Goodrow. As for the Rouge people, he is glad to have them as neighbors and he would like to see their development go through, but he doesn't want to see this road create a situation where his elderly stepmother ends up sideways in that gate, and he doesn't think the City would want the liability of all that would come with that anyway. Please do your due diligence and give this some thought.

*Having no additional requests to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.*

Staff was asked to discuss the turn coming down Goodrow, and David Peck indicated that he is not aware of any ice issue on that road, but it could be addressed by plowing snow or adding cinders. There are many turns like this one in Sedona; it is a little greater than 90°, but staff doesn't believe there are any issues with the turn. There will be stop signs at all three legs of the intersection as well.

Regarding the number of accidents, David clarified that over the last three years, there were 12 accidents at Rodeo and the details don't break out how those accidents occurred, but there were five accidents at Goodrow, and when you consider the ratio of the traffic on Goodrow that will be coming out to Rodeo, it is roughly 25% of what Rodeo has, so his calculations show that the increase of an accident happening at Goodrow versus Rodeo is about 75% more, and it is never safer to concentrate traffic at an unsignalized intersection.

#### **Commission's Questions, Comments and Concerns:**

- Question about the availability of a tree survey showing the ratio and requirements, etc., since it is not shown on the ALTA survey. Cari explained that the existing trees are designated differently than the new trees on the Landscaping Plan.
- Comment that the trees shown in the Landscaping Plan must have been surveyed. Richard Hubbell, Landscape Architect, explained that the existing tree survey was prepared in conjunction with the topography.
- Question as to if the Commission has a copy of that. Mr. Hubbell explained that he transferred the existing trees to the Landscape Plan and there is a summary on there.
- Question regarding the existing trees being shown as dashed and if that means that they stay or will be removed, because they are shown the same way under the driveways and parking area. Mr. Hubbell explained that he believes he showed by a symbol on the trunk, either a solid circle for the trunk or an open circle to designate if they are to be saved or removed.
- Comment that it is hard to see in an 8½ x 11. Erik Peterson added that in the site plan as well, the dark circles with the tree size all exist within the courtyard and the layout was to retain a lot of those. Mr. Hubbell then explained that in an earlier project, he had provided the boundary and location of the trees in the topography, but the Commission couldn't see how that related to the location of the proposed improvement, so that is why he did the overlay. Erik Peterson added that they were trying to keep the buildings farther from the residents.

- Comment that the concern is more about the trees in the open space and around the parking lot as opposed to the ones in the private zones.
- Question about the availability of the exterior material samples. Cari indicated that it is the same materials board used for the Sedona Rouge.
- Question about what material will be used for the retaining walls, sidewalks and curbs in Parcel A. Erik Peterson indicated that their intent for the retaining walls is to do them as an art piece with a native landscape, and Erik then showed a couple of examples from Scottsdale with the integration of artistic pieces.
- Comment that it would be good to see that as part of the record.
- Question about the location for the gate and what it looks like? Erik pointed out the location for the gate, and Al Walburg added that the gate hasn't been totally designed yet. He also explained that Mr. Corder doesn't lose his entrance, because anyone can come up Goodrow and through the gate as it will open automatically, plus they are going to widen the portion from 89A up to their parking lot to 20 ft. The gate will remain closed when driving south, and that is what the neighbors object to.
- Comment that these things should be part of the plan that the Commission is approving. During the work sessions, it was expected that these things would be presented at the final hearing, so the question is if we feel comfortable approving it without seeing these things.
- Comment regarding the parking lot, in accordance with the proposal from the start, it is a good idea as far as trying to make everything safer and reconfigure the property from the original lodging uses on the back parcel, but part of the situation is that the parking lot, that was a place holder before, is designed with 41 spaces as efficiently as a Wal Mart parking lot, against a residential zone, and the impact statement indicated that as many of the trees as possible would be saved, so the expectation was to see that tonight and it is not part of the plan. Screening the parking with more than a 5 ft. buffer is important, especially against a residential zone, so there should be more screening there by utilizing the existing trees as best we can.
- Comment that regarding the access, we have discussed the safety of the different aspects and this was overall safer, but hearing about the hill being icy is new and is now coming into play. The grading plan shows the new intersection as being relatively level, so if you can stop at the stop sign, you can make the turn.
- Comment regarding the new alignment with Contractors Road that is one lot away, so if there isn't any proposed name for the road, perhaps Contractors Road would be good and would encourage another connection in the future through that residential lot.

*Note: Chair Losoff requested that there be no further comments from the audience or he would have to ask people to leave.*

- Comment that the naming of that road would be up to the City.
- Comment that regarding the notion of adaptive or native plants, they are both low water usage, and we can discuss updating the land use code requirements in the future.
- Request to determine if there was consensus regarding interest in seeing what the gate will look like as well as the screening of the parking lot. Three Commissioners indicated yes and there was a request to also see the retaining walls. Another Commissioner wasn't opposed to seeing it, but had another question as well.
- Comment that the ideas are very good, but they should be part of the packet.
- Question about a process for the Commission to see these things at a future date, if it is approved. Audree Juhlin indicated that we can stipulate the approval of this proposal with the condition that when the gate and the screening walls are designed, they need to come back for consideration and approval by the Commission.
- Question about the need for the Commission to get into all of the details versus staff having some discretion. As a condition it could come back to staff, and if there is a problem, then it could come back to the Commission.
- Comment that the Commission should have a general idea of what the gate will be.

Chair Losoff then summarized that the Commission will ask, as a condition, that this be established. and the same thing with the wall by the parking lot; however, the Chair was asked if the intent was the trees and shrubs by the parking lot, and Audree Juhlin indicated that the retention walls were one of the items brought up.

- Comment that the biggest deal is to preserve more of the screening around and in the parking lot, to actually reduce the number of parking spaces. The guidelines suggest that there be reductions in the amount of parking required, but here we have an increase over what is required. Just have what is required and use the rest of the space for some of the mature landscaping in that area.
- Comment that it is kind of late in the game to add things at the last minute.
- Request to hear from the applicant about a proposed reduction in parking spaces.
- Comment that there is a tree well every seven spaces, so what if a couple of the tree wells were eliminated on the west side in exchange for more existing trees to remain on the east side, which would border the residential area. Al Walburg explained that before, the Commission had expressed concern about parking for the spa, the visitors, etc., so getting 41 parking spaces here, they are losing a couple below where the road was put through from the lobby, so it is a balanced site now as far as total parking spaces throughout the existing and the addition and the 41 spaces are important to them.
- Clarification that the suggestion isn't that you lose any spaces, just that maybe there could be more trees on the east side. Al Walburg indicated that there aren't any existing trees of any substance on the east side and we are aware that they need to screen Mr. DeGeorge's property from the parking lot, and that is included in the Landscape Plan.

The Chair then asked if the Commission wants to see a condition or change at this stage of the game. There was no consensus as the Commission was split three and three. Staff then asked what the Commission specifically wants the applicant to do, and Ron Ramsey added that he wants to be sure that what is on the floor is clear, in terms of what the Commission is asking. The Chair agreed that a clarification was needed, because on the site visits, the parking lot screening had been discussed.

- Comment that the impact statement says that landscape islands are provided per the City of Sedona's Land Development Code and every attempt will be made to maintain existing trees, and that is why the question was asked about the location of the existing trees. There is no survey that shows it and the Landscape Plan shows trees dashed, so it could mean that they are removed. So, the intent is to have the applicant follow through with that proposal. It is a large parking lot directly adjacent to a residential zone and the Landscape Plan just shows the standard minimum code requirement.
- Comment that the trees were seen on the site visit and the thought was that they would be sufficient.
- Comment that if there were existing substantial trees, there would be agreement with the concern, but it isn't known if there are. Audree Juhlin indicated that it seems that the Commission is trying to say maybe have a little bit of flexibility in the interpretation of the landscaping islands as far as parking is concerned. Look onsite and see if there are any places on the east side where we can preserve trees and not have the landscape islands on the east side, so if those trees are identified, we can save them and put the islands on the west side if necessary, so we aren't losing any parking spaces, but rearranging the islands in order to accommodate any existing vegetation on the east side of the parking lot.
- Comment that the thought was to take the islands off of the west side and move them to the east side to accommodate existing trees, but the parking count would stay the same. If there are no substantial trees to save, then it is a moot point.
- Question about adding more trees along the edge to soften the residents' view. Audree Juhlin indicated that could be a request; the Landscaping Plan does include some buffering along that area, but if you want more, you have the right to ask for that.

- Comment that it would help the neighbors to have less view of the area and if it would make the neighbors more comfortable with the project, it might be worth it.

**Summary Discussion:**

The Chair asked if the applicant was okay with that idea and Al Walburg indicated yes, they think they have it covered. The Commission mentioned it before and they commissioned Mr. Hubbell to make a valid Landscape Plan to do that, and Mr. Hubbell has done that. Mr. Hubbell then explained that he made a concentrated effort to address the east side. He first went to the code to see what is required and what the intent is, while being sensitive to the neighbors. He walked along that property line and took into account what was on the property line and the other side of the property line. He didn't survey what is on other people's property, but he noted where that landscaping was located and placed the applicant's landscaping in the areas where there was blank space between existing landscape on the east side of the property. He knows an issue is what if the neighbors remove their vegetation, but he doesn't want to plant in front of existing vegetation, so he looked at what people would visually see and he put the landscaping in the open spaces. It is balanced with the existing vegetation on the other side of the fence, while honoring the existing big trees and vegetation. He walked the property twice to address that and this is the fifth time this has been looked at. Had this been brought up in an earlier meeting, he could have had more information to respond. He has given total integrity to satisfying the need for that.

The Chair then indicated that he was using his prerogative to end the discussion on landscaping; we have heard enough on it, and he doesn't know that we have a consensus. There have been two site visits and several meetings, and it wasn't a significant issue in the past. Some Commissioners would like some additional information and staff and the applicant can put these things together to see what conditions we can create to try to establish some compromise, but we are spending too much time on the subject right now.

Cari Meyer indicated that what she has heard is that there might be some support for moving some of the landscape peninsulas around, based on the location of existing trees, and there is some support for exploring additional screening for the neighboring properties, and both of those can be done at a staff level, so she has noted that the applicant and staff shall work together to address those items and see if they are feasible, and that is something that can be done as they go through the permitting process.

The Chair stated that the Commission also wants to ensure that the material for the gate is appropriate and will meet the Design Review Manual criteria, etc. Cari then asked if the gate and retaining walls are things that the Commission wants to leave to the discretion of staff or come back to the Commission. The Chair indicated that it could come back to the Commission as a report from staff; it comes back for approval if staff feels it doesn't meet the criteria. It would just be a reporting mechanism from staff if it is okay, and if not, take it to the next level.

**Commission's Questions, Comments and Concerns (continued):**

- Comment that it had been discussed earlier that the new connection at Goodrow could be one-way traffic at the south end into the existing parking lot, and that it actually be two-way traffic for the benefit of all. The Chair noted that when the comment came up before, there wasn't a consensus for that to happen.
- Comment that it looks like it is big enough for that on the site plan; however, the Chair restated that there was no consensus and the applicant went ahead on that basis, but if it is important enough, we can bring it up at the end again.
- Comment to confirm the understanding was that the applicant didn't want a high volume of traffic going through the parking lot, but the applicant is willing to live with the northbound traffic going through it and the gate will open automatically so people can go home, but when leaving, they can't go through Goodrow to 89A, so they would use the new road to get onto Rodeo Road. Al Walburg indicated that is correct; when you have 41 parking spaces and people unpacking, etc., they want to limit it as much as possible, and when going uphill, vehicles are hopefully going slower than going downhill, and they also hope their guests will leave by going



uphill. It is a different safety issue when people are going down Goodrow to turn left onto 89A, so through discussions with staff, it evolved to what they feel is the right way of doing it for the safety of all concerned. It is also very positive that ADOT has said that they would consider making two left-turn lanes.

- Question about allowing only people who want to turn right to go down Goodrow to 89A and post no left turn at 89A. Andy Dickey indicated that staff has talked with ADOT before about trying to use those types of restrictions, and they are not supportive of those, because they feel they aren't enforceable and they don't want to allow it in their right-of-way. Al Walburg also referenced a discussion with a lady who attended the work session and indicated that he asked her if she was going to turn right or left at the bottom of Goodrow, and she said she was going to turn right and go beyond Safeway, so logically what is the difference? There is nothing safer than turning right at a signalized intersection. They had to pay for the new right turn lane, and you have to work your way over at least one lane, so it is safer to go down Rodeo and make the right turn.
- Question about any restrictions on the applicant to further restrict traffic through Parcel B, since it will be private property, such as by putting a gate at the south end. Andy Dickey indicated no, and Cari indicated that they would have to provide emergency access.
- Question about having a Condition of Approval that the applicant would have to come back to the Commission if they wanted to block northbound access. Audree Juhlin explained that the Commission is only considering approval of the site with the gate on the north end and not a gate on the south end. If they brought that in as a proposal, staff would bring that back to the Commission. They could not simply put up a gate.
- Question regarding page 5 of the Development Standards Checklist, where there are two checked -- yes, and not applicable. Cari Meyer indicated that is a mistake; it is supposed to be yes.
- Question regarding the parking of large vehicles on page 7 of the same report. For 912.08, it says that if you strictly applied the code, there would have to be four spaces for large vehicles, but their guests don't generally require such parking, so does that mean maybe 10% or it hardly ever happens. Al Walburg indicated that it almost never happens. Buses pick up people for the jeep tours, and they haven't had tour buses come in.
- Comment that the report sounded like staff thought the possibility might come up. Audree Juhlin stated that there is always a possibility.
- Comment of how it would be monitored if it came up. Audree Juhlin indicated that if a tour bus stayed overnight, those rooms would be occupied by people on the bus, so an area could be designated for the bus; there is a way to work with it.
- Question regarding possible inconsistency on pages 9 and 10 of the report related to covered parking. Cari explained that this is part of the Design Review Checklist as things that are encouraged, but not necessarily required. Covered parking is encouraged, and if provided, the Design Review Manual states that the covering should be complimentary to the building, etc.
- Comment that questions regarding the Development Agreement had been forwarded to the Assistant City Attorney who responded, but one remaining question is who is paying the premium for the Title Insurance. It is not clear whether Sedona Rouge is paying for an owner's policy on both parcels. Al Walburg indicated that they pay all.
- Suggestion that it be clarified in the Development Agreement in Section 2.8.
- Comment complementing staff on an excellent report and the applicant on the application.
- Question about ADOT not allowing the intersection of Goodrow and 89A to be changed in any way, so there is no way southbound traffic on Goodrow can exit onto 89A. Andy Dickey clarified that he was referring to an existing intersection like that, without reconstructing the interface. They don't want to allow just signage; there would have to be some curbing, a pork chop, etc.
- Comment that previous concerns about perhaps allowing two-way traffic have been satisfied after hearing from the applicant, staff and ADOT . . .

*Note: The Chair requested a member of the audience who interrupted the speaker to leave.*

- David Peck indicated that there isn't any advantage to making a right turn at Goodrow versus Rodeo, unless you are going to the Rouge; they would actually be heading eastbound for a distance on Goodrow before getting to 89A.
- Comment regarding a section in the Staff Report about the use of native evergreens as opposed to adaptive, and having been on the Commission when the Landscape Ordinance was redone, it is agreed that the adaptive plants should be acceptable, because they are equally drought resistant and they grow faster.
- There are some good conditions about the event lawn, and the fact that the courtyard is not totally in the shade is good also.
- Comment that in 2009, the project that was approved was a parking lot with two-way traffic through, and seeing this reworked, the current solution is much better and all who made an effort to get it to this stage are to be applauded.
- Comment that staff has answered all of the concerns about the safety of the road and that is appreciated.
- Comment that while the residents at the top of Goodrow aren't happy with the southbound travel, it realistically is safer, and understanding accidents, it is much safer the way it is designed, although there is concern about the neighbors traveling down to the gate if it is slippery. They are being inconvenienced for the benefit of the project, so would there be a way of improving upper Goodrow to ease the concerns of those residents. Al Walburg indicated that Charles Mosley and staff really brought them into the land swap thing, but they decided that if there is a situation in the winter with black ice or snow, etc., they would be willing to leave the gate open so they could just slide on through into their parking lot. Audree Juhlin added that the approval could be conditioned based on that willingness.
- Comment that it might not be realistic to know when you are going to have black ice and have people call to ask if you can open the gate, because they are sliding down now, but if they are having concerns, it is important to the Commission.

Chair Losoff indicated that the Commission has talked enough about this issue, and when it comes for a vote if the Commission thinks it is significant enough, we will have to take it into account, but right now let's move on.

- Question about having a no right-turn sign for guests where the roadway going past the front lobby and curves to the left. Al Walburg explained that they would leave out the main exit on 89A. Andy Dickey proposed that it be on the record that if an issue develops after it is constructed, the City will assess any adjustments that need to be made, which could include making that roadway one way for that segment, and he would propose that. Chair Losoff then asked for that to be a condition.
- Question about having "no through traffic" signs, so a guest won't go up that way, but if that needs to be addressed in the future, staff could do the same thing. Andy Dickey added that they recently thought that it could be necessary to put a sign in the private parking lot to direct tourists to the signalized intersection, so they don't go the wrong direction. Reducing the number of possible conflicts at that intersection is not a bad thing, and the exact detail of that will be further improved as they work through the development and permitting process.
- Comment that the Commissioner is very comfortable in giving staff the leeway to do these things in the future.
- Question regarding page 19 under Conditions of Approval, where it discusses the applicant's role in satisfying the Land Development Code requirement for public art, as to which option the applicant is selecting and if that is supposed to be in the Development Agreement. Cari explained that it wouldn't necessarily be in the Development Agreement, since it is a code requirement and they can choose a cash contribution or install art in lieu of that. Something like what they are proposing on the retaining walls could be something that may be considered, but it would have to be accepted by the City.
- Question as to if we know which direction they are headed. Al Walburg indicated they are going to start with the retaining walls.

- Question as to if that would come back to staff for review. Audree Juhlin indicated that it would not come back to the Commission, and staff would be bringing changes to that section of the Land Development Code to the Commission the end of May.
- Question regarding the status of a neighbor's concerns about erosion control, landscape buffer for privacy, the property line and signage. Cari indicated that the applicant has been working with her, and they have agreed to do additional landscaping between her house and the new road, and the property line was resolved. The erosion will be addressed through the permitting process and questions about stop signs were answered.

Chair Losoff indicated that there were several meetings and comprises made, so he wanted to thank everybody involved. The Commission has also been very thorough and the responses have been there. We have to look at the overall project and ask if individual components are significant enough to impact the final decision, but he is satisfied with the changes. We have discussed traffic at length and with what staff is asking for and what the applicant is willing to do, we will come up with a reasonable and worthwhile project. There would have been more reservations about the access if it wasn't for the fact that ADOT is indicating they are going to make these improvements, and that makes all the difference.

The Chair then asked staff to summarize the conditions discussed. Cari indicated that the additional conditions were that the Commission wanted staff to bring back the retaining wall and gate for review, when the design is finalized. Chair Losoff clarified that they would bring it to staff, and then staff would bring it to the Commission if there is a concern; otherwise, it would be brought to the Commission for information purposes. Cari then noted that she has that the applicant and staff will work to determine if it is feasible to move some of the landscape peninsulas, in order to save existing vegetation/trees by locating the peninsulas in an area that would allow the trees to be incorporated into the peninsulas. And, the applicant and staff will work with the neighboring property owners to make sure sufficient screening between the hotel property and neighboring properties is achieved. Also, staff and the applicant, after the development is complete, will reevaluate the internal traffic flow and determine if any further restrictions are needed. Audree Juhlin then asked if the Commission wants a condition that the applicant assesses weather conditions and where warranted leaves the gate open for southbound access from Goodrow.

Vice Chair Hadley asked about making a motion and reflecting the new conditions, and Audree Juhlin indicated that the motion can be made with language saying as amended in tonight's meeting, and the Vice Chair added, and in the minutes.

***MOTION: Vice Chair Hadley moved to approve the proposed Development Review for the Sedona Rouge Expansion as set forth in case number PZ13-00013 (DEV) based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Development Review findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report and as modified at the April 15, 2014 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting, as defined in the minutes. Commissioner Jablow seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and one (1) opposed. Commissioner Brandt was opposed and Commissioner Taylor was excused.***

*Note: The additional Conditions of Approval referenced during the meeting were finalized as follows:*

1. *Prior to issuance of permits for the retaining walls and the gate, the applicant shall work with staff to ensure the retaining walls and gate are designed in accordance with all applicable codes and requirements and in a compatible style with the rest of the development. Staff shall present the final design of the retaining walls and gate to the Planning and Zoning Commission for informational purposes.*
2. *The applicant shall work with staff to determine the feasibility of, and where possible, relocating one or more of the landscape islands to allow for the preservation of existing trees and vegetation.*

3. *The applicant shall work with staff and neighboring property owners to ensure the parking lot is sufficiently screened from neighboring properties.*
4. *The applicant shall work with staff to determine what, if any, additional measures are needed to control traffic flow from the front of the hotel to the expansion area. Additional control measures could include, but are not limited to, turning restrictions or additional signage. The applicant and staff agree to meet and confer in the future if any issues arise and agree to explore possible solutions. If necessary, ADOT may be consulted regarding access to and from the ADOT right-of-way at Goodrow Lane.*
5. *The applicant shall monitor the condition of the road north of the expansion parking lot and the intersection of Goodrow Lane and the new connector road. If hazardous weather driving conditions exist (e.g. icy, snow), the applicant shall notify the City of Sedona and leave the parking lot gate open to allow for two-way traffic until any hazardous condition is remedied.*

Chair Losoff then indicated he would entertain a motion regarding the proposed Zone Change.

***MOTION: Vice Chair Hadley moved to recommend to the Sedona City Council approval of the proposed rezoning as set forth in case number PZ13-00013 (ZC) from L (Lodging - 32 units) to L (Lodging - 32 units) based on compliance with Land Development Code requirements, conformance with the requirements for approval of a zone change and consistency and conformance with the Community Plan, and subject to all applicable ordinance requirements and the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report.***

Commissioner Currivan questioned if that motion is worded correctly and Ron Ramsey explained that you are rezoning the Residential. The Chair noted that there was no second to the motion, so the motion is off of the table.

Cari then stated that it would be from L (Lodging) and RS-10A (Single-Family Residential) to L (Lodging). If a zone change were not approved and the land exchange were approved, the resultant parcel would have split zoning of Lodging and Residential, and the recommendation is if the land exchange is approved, the entire parcel would be Lodging.

Ron Ramsey explained that it seems that if you just read the motion, it would make more sense to just change the RS zoning, but the parcel is zoned half Lodging because of an interpretation of the code that the zoning, that now ends at the property line, continues to the midsection of a street, so this will make it clear that the entire parcel becomes Lodging.

***REVISED MOTION: Vice Chair Hadley moved to recommend to the Sedona City Council approval of the proposed rezoning as set forth in case number PZ13-00013 (ZC) from L (Lodging) and RS-10A (Residential) to L (Lodging) based on compliance with Land Development Code requirements, conformance with the requirements for approval of a zone change and consistency and conformance with the Community Plan, and subject to all applicable ordinance requirements and the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Jablow seconded the motion.***

Commissioner Currivan asked if the fact that the 32 units wasn't mentioned matters, and Cari indicated no, because it is in the Conditions of Approval.

***VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Taylor was excused.***

Chair Losoff explained that the Land Exchange and the Development Agreement are not under the Commission's purview; however, he noticed that the date says something in March. Ron Ramsey explained that he has notes to make some corrections to the Development Agreement. The dates are off, so those corrections will be made, and he has made note that you also want to have Section 2.8 clarified that the owner's policy would apply as to both parcels, so that will be inserted. In the section on the obligations of Sedona Rouge, he made a note to add Section 4.4, as it is something we have all discussed, and that is Sedona Rouge will be making the improvements to

the south part of Goodrow Lane, so that should also be in the Development Agreement. Another note is going back to the changing of the deeds, because when the City Council performs the exchange, there is a separate statute that addresses land exchanges by a city, and it says that statute has to make a finding that they are substantially equal in value or what other conditions may be necessary on the record, so there will be some language tweaked in that ordinance to have some indication of what that value is, because Sedona Rouge's value, in terms of the road as it is improved, will exceed the value of the unimproved property they will be getting, but that value will also be diminished by the fact that part of that road is already on top of an easement they already gave the City, and he will likely repeat in that ordinance some of the key conditions that may exist in the Development Agreement, so that drafting is yet to be done. Chair Losoff then asked that the finalized Development Agreement be shared with the Commission.

**7. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS (10 minutes; 7:15 pm– 7:25 pm)**

- a. **Thursday, May 1, 2014; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- b. **Tuesday, May 6, 2014; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- c. **Thursday, May 15, 2014; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- d. **Tuesday, May 20, 2014; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Cari explained that the Sky Ridge work session is being rescheduled to May 6th with the public hearing for Sedona ATV's CUP renewal, so May 1st is canceled, and there is nothing on the agendas for May 15 and 20th at this time. Audree clarified that on May 15th, we are planning to bring the proposed amendments to the Land Development Code, Public Art Ordinance, to the Commission for a work session. Chair Losoff noted that he will not be available on May 15th, and Audree added that we may have the public hearing on May 20th if all goes well on the 15th. Cari noted that a monthly status report will also be provided on the 6th, and Chair Losoff suggested an update on the Citizen Engagement groups for community benefits and the Development Review process on the 6th or 15th.

**8. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:**

- a. **To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).**
- b. **Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.**

*No Executive Session was held.*

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 7:32 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on April 15, 2014.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

---

Date